



Attorney's Docket No. 7604

**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of: DAIGRE, RICHARD

Serial No.: 0 10 / 058,183

Group No.: 3683

Filed: JAN.. 26, 2002

Examiner: KING, B.T.

For: MECHANICALLY APPLIED/HYDRAULICALLY RELEASED BRAKE

**Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231**

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)**

I hereby certify that the *attached* correspondence comprising:

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL  
INTERVIEW SUMMARY (COPY 12/10/4 FILING)  
AMENDMENT (COY 12/10/4 FILING)  
POSTCARD

addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

on

2105

WILIAM S. LIGHTBODY

(type or print name of person mailing paper)

William S. Lightbody

Signature of person mailing paper



Applicant: Daigre, R. Examiner: King, B.T.  
Serial No: 10/058,183 Art Unit: 3683  
File Date: January 26, 2002 Our File: 7604  
Invention: MECHANICALLY APPLIED/HYDRAULICALLY RELEASED BRAKE

December 8, 2004

LIGHTBODY LAW OFFICE  
32600 Fairmount Boulevard  
Atrium Suite 100  
Pepper Pike, Ohio 44124  
(216) 621-7337 Phone  
(216) 621-7393 FAX

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Mail Stop Amendment  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Dear Commissioner:

On December 2, 2004, applicant, by and through his attorney William S. Lightbody, interviewed the examiner, Bradley T. King, in respect to the above entitled application.

In respect to the Larson reference, applicant noted that in Larson the brake lever 55 extends from one side to the other side of the drive shaft while in the applicant's embodiment, this is not true. Applicant, therefore, proposed to amend certain independent claims to recite that the mechanical activator was "wholly" on the said rotary shaft, thus to distinguish over the straddling lever 55 of Larson. After a brief discussion of claim 1 and the location of the

Larson cam 45, the examiner indicated that he would consider the matter upon a submission of an amendment adding the term "wholly" to the independent claims.

The interview continued with a discussion of the Cox reference with the applicant requesting the reconsideration of the rejection based on the additional size and complication which would be necessary to modify Cox as suggested by the examiner--all producing a larger and more mechanically complex structure. The examiner indicated again that he would reconsider this matter upon the submission of an amendment formally placing this issue in front of him.

Applicant includes herewith the amendment accomplishing this. Favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William S. Lightbody  
William S. Lightbody